

12. A Compared Analysis of Gürpınar's and Unamuno's Dog Characters within the Cartesian Thinking Framework¹

Mehmet KAYGUSUZ² & Kubilay GEÇİKLİ³

APA: Kaygusuz, M. & Geçikli, K. (2024). A Compared Analysis of Gürpınar's and Unamuno's Dog Characters within the Cartesian Thinking Framework. *RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Arařtırmaları Dergisi*, (43), 249-263. **DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14064976>

Abstract

Animals have been analysed in different contexts under the umbrella of animal studies. In this study, how animals were perceived in two different cultures when anthropocentric thought was not yet questioned as it is today, is evaluated in parallel with Descartes' views on animals. In this study, the novels *Şık* by Hüseyin Rahmi Gürpınar, and *Mist (Niebla)* by Miguel de Unamuno, written in close historical intervals and having various similar characteristics, were analysed. As a result of the analysis, it was seen that both dogs were included in the works for a purpose and were chosen as tools to strengthen the narrative. Therefore, both works do not take animal consciousness and specificity into account. Gürpınar, who successfully portrays Turkish street life in his novels, satirises the artificial Westernisation in accordance with his literary character and depicts a stray dog putting itself into disgraceful situations in parallel with its main character. The inner world of the dog is not mirrored; the dog is not a conscious being and is dragged behind its instincts. Unamuno includes the dog in his novel for two different purposes: to continue the main character's existential questioning through monologues, and to create a kind of change in perception and criticise society by making the dog speak at the end. It was freed from his own instincts; it thought, and interpreted, gained its own existence according to Descartes' conceptual understanding. The comparative analysis of these works will contribute to both animal studies and comparative literature studies.

Keywords: Animal studies, comparative studies, Cartesian thinking, Şık, Niebla

- ¹ **Beyan (Tez/ Bildiri):** Bu çalışmanın hazırlanma sürecinde bilimsel ve etik ilkelere uyulduğu ve yararlanılan tüm çalışmaların kaynakçada belirtildiği beyan olunur.
Çıkar Çatışması: Çıkar çatışması beyan edilmemiştir.
Finansman: Bu arařtırmaı desteklemek için dış fon kullanılmamıştır.
Telif Hakkı & Lisans: Yazarlar dergide yayınlanan çalışmalarının telif hakkına sahiptirler ve çalışmalarını CC BY-NC 4.0 lisansı altında yayımlanmaktadır.
Kaynak: Bu çalışmanın hazırlanma sürecinde bilimsel ve etik ilkelere uyulduğu ve yararlanılan tüm çalışmaların kaynakçada belirtildiği beyan olunur.
Benzerlik Raporu: Alındı –Ithenticate / İntihal, Oran: %9
Etik Şikayeti: editor@rumelide.com
Makale Türü: Arařtırma makalesi, **Makale Kayıt Tarihi:** 12.09.2024-**Kabul Tarihi:** 20.12.2024-**Yayın Tarihi:** 21.12.2024; **DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14064976>
Hakem Değerlendirmesi: İki Dış Hakem / Çift Taraflı Körleme
² Öğr. Gör., Atatürk Üniversitesi, Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu, Yabancı Diller Bölümü / Lect, Atatürk University, School of Foreign Languages, Department of Foreign Languages (Erzurum, Türkiye), kmehmet@atauni.edu.tr, **ORCID ID:** <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5125-7461> **ROR ID:** <https://ror.org/03je5c526>, **ISNI:** [0000 0001 0775 759X](https://isni.org/0000-0001-0775-759X), **Crossref Funder ID:** [501100004951](https://orcid.org/501100004951)
³ Doç. Dr., Atatürk Üniversitesi, Edebiyat Fakültesi, İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Bölümü / Assoc. Prof. Dr., Atatürk University, Faculty of Letters, Department of English Language and Literature (Erzurum, Türkiye), kgecikli@atauni.edu.tr, **ORCID ID:** <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4154-1298> **ROR ID:** <https://ror.org/03je5c526>, **ISNI:** [0000 0001 0775 759X](https://isni.org/0000-0001-0775-759X), **Crossref Funder ID:** [501100004951](https://orcid.org/501100004951)

Gürpınar ve Unamuno'nun Köpek Karakterlerinin Kartezyen Düşünce Çerçevesinde Karşılaştırmalı Analizi 4

Öz

Hayvanlar, hayvan çalışmaları çatı başlığı altında farklı bağlamlarda incelenmiştir. Bu çalışmada köpekler özelinde, iki farklı kültürde henüz insan merkezci düşünce günümüzde olduğu gibi sorgulanmamışken hayvanların nasıl algılandığı Descartes'in hayvanlara dair görüşlerine paralel biçimde değerlendirilmiştir. Çalışmada, yakın tarih aralıklarında kaleme alınan ve çeşitli benzer özellikler taşıyan, önde gelen Türk yazarlardan Hüseyin Rahmi Gürpınar'ın *Şık* adlı romanı ile İspanyol edebiyatına yön veren yazarlardan Miguel de Unamuno'nun *Sis* adlı eseri analiz edilmiştir. İnceleme sonucunda, her iki köpeğin de bir amaç doğrultusunda eserlere dahil edildiği ve aslında anlatımı güçlendirmek için birer araç olarak seçildiği görülmüştür. Haliyle en başından iki eserin de hayvan bilincini ve özgüllüğünü dikkate almadığı söylenebilir. Öte yandan Türk sokak hayatını başarıyla romanlarına taşıyan Gürpınar edebi karakterine uygun olarak yapay batılılaşmayı hicvederken ana karakteri ile paralel bir sokak köpeğinin kendini rezil durumlara sokmasını resmeder. Köpeğin iç dünyasına ayna tutulmaz, köpek bilinçli bir varlık değildir ve iç güdülerinin ardı sıra sürüklenir. Unamuno ise köpeği iki farklı amaçla romanına dahil eder: ana karakteri monologlarla varoluşsal sorgulamalarına devam ettirebilmek ve romanın sonunda köpeği konuşTURARAK bir tür algı değişimi yaratıp toplum eleştirisi yapmak. Bu sebeple kendi içgüdülerinden sıyrılmış, düşünmüş ve yorumlamıştır. Descartes'in kavramsal anlayışına göre kendi varoluşunu kazanmıştır. Bu iki eserin kıyaslamalı incelemesi hem hayvan çalışmalarına hem karşılaştırmalı edebiyat çalışmalarına katkı sağlayacaktır.

Anahtar kelimeler: Hayvan alışmaları, karşılaştırmalı çalışmalar, Kartezyen düşünce, *Şık*, *Sis*

4

Statement (Thesis / Paper):

It is declared that scientific and ethical principles were followed during the preparation process of this study and all the studies utilised are indicated in the bibliography.

Conflict of Interest: No conflict of interest is declared.

Funding: No external funding was used to support this research.

Copyright & Licence: The authors own the copyright of their work published in the journal and their work is published under the CC BY-NC 4.0 licence.

Source: It is declared that scientific and ethical principles were followed during the preparation of this study and all the studies used are stated in the bibliographies.

Similarity Report: Received –Ithenticate, Rate: %9

Ethics Complaint: editor@rumelide.com

Article Type: Research article, **Article Registration Date:** 12.09.2024-**Acceptance Date:** 20.12.2024-**Publication Date:** 21.12.2024; **DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14064976>

Peer Review: Two External Referees / Double Blind

Introduction

How much I taught him with my silences,
as I licked his hand, while he spoke over and over again to me!
'Can you understand me', he would say to me.
Yes, of course I understood him,
I understood him when he spoke to me while speaking to himself,
and he talked and talked endlessly.
(Unamuno, 2006, p. 397)

As a species, human beings acquire ideas by moulding their perceptions with their environment, and this is how thinking processes, once claimed to be uniquely human, can be managed. Thoughts are transmitted using languages, and the intellectual worlds of the generations that follow are thus moulded. Grandchildren perpetuate the perspectives of their ancestors. Therefore, human beings' relationship with the environment is directly related to the approaches they inherit. Similarly, how one perceives other species is related not only to oneself but also to the views transmitted to oneself through social memory. For this reason, how we perceive dogs, which Donna Haraway (2003) calls companions, with whom humans have a common history and who are among the species that interact with humans the most, is not purely our own point of view. Our perspectives are shaped by cultures; hence, to understand a perspective, the culture must also be examined. Culture and humans' perspectives are best reflected in literary works, either with the observations of the author or with hints regarding the author's own opinions.

In this study, to reveal how dogs, our companion species, are portrayed in literature, two novels that were written more than a hundred years ago are to be examined. A novel from Turkish literature, *Şık* (1888), penned by Hüseyin Rahmi Gürpınar will be compared to another from Spanish literature, *Mist (La Niebla)* (1914) penned by Miguel de Unamuno. In both stories, adopted dogs are somehow included, but they do not shape or orient the stories by themselves. The dogs in the stories are similar to those who wander and survive on the streets every day — the only difference is that Unamuno's Orfeo is made to talk at the end of the novel for the funeral of the author.

The common point of these works of two writers, who were born in 1864, grew up in different geographies but witnessed the same historical events and wrote about the society they were in, is dogs, and will be examined within the framework of Cartesian thought because, as will be discussed, there are both similar and different points in the approach to dogs in these two novels. If we consider that animals also have an important place in Descartes' thoughts on existence, it will reveal how the narratives of the two writers, who grew up in Eastern and Western thought centres, reflect Cartesian thought.

About Hüseyin Rahmi Gürpınar

Born in the last period of the Ottoman Empire, Hüseyin Rahmi Gürpınar published his first novel in the *Tercüman-ı Hakikat* newspaper in 1888. Gürpınar, who has a productive profile with his novels, stories, and plays, has a strong point of humour. He has been the writer who has benefitted the most from the classical genres of literature in the field of comedy; thus, he has been able to preserve the local atmosphere in his works (Moran, 2008, p. 77). Gürpınar, choosing the themes he worked on more suitable for the street, in other words, close to the people, had an observation or humour between the Turkish and Western borders that were unfamiliar to people (Tanpınar, 1977, p. 119). According to

Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar, Hüseyin Rahmi's approach to people remained shallow and superficial because he did not put the warmth of love in any of his works. The reason for this is that his desire is to replace the people's mentality based on traditional beliefs, settled thoughts, customs, and religion with the positivist mentality of the West based on reason and science (Moran, 2008, p. 66). For this purpose, instead of choosing characters with high moral values, he tried to achieve his goal by progressing through certain themes through characters who were either too traditionalist or could achieve Westernisation superficially.

Gürpınar has dealt with themes such as Westernisation, superstition, conflict between morality and financial difficulties, disagreement in love and marriage, and social misery in his works. While he wanted to remain loyal to the realist and naturalist movements while doing all these, romantic outbursts, unnecessary interventions, and irrelevant considerations and explanations are also noticeable in his works (Özbalcı, 1991, p. 208). However, despite all these flaws, his novels managed to reflect the known social realities of the period in which he lived. This earned him a special place in literature, made society love reading, and pushed society to think between Westernisation and ideology. His ability to reflect social realities is also the reason why he was chosen for the scope of the present study.

About Miguel de Unomuno

Miguel de Unamuno, a prominent figure in Spanish literature and philosophy, made a lasting impact on both disciplines in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Unamuno, born in 1864 in Bilbao, Spain, is known for his thorough examination of the human situation, existential inquiry, and strong concentration on the individual's desire for purpose and identity. His existential inquiry led him to learn Danish just to read Kierkegaard in original texts, from whom he was immensely impressed (Caraway, 1995, p. 152). The author's writing exhibits a distinctive combination of existentialist ideology and self-reflection as well as a fervent exploration of philosophical and theological subjects.

Unamuno made significant and profound contributions to both literature and philosophy. He gained recognition mostly for his novels, essays, and poetry, in which he engaged with intricate philosophical enquiries while exploring the profound realms of human sentiment and psychology. The book *The Tragic Sense of Life* (1926) represents his fundamental contribution, encapsulating his philosophical perspective. In this work, he delves into the conflict between rationality and belief, the pursuit of eternal existence, and the distress caused by human finitude.

Unamuno's writings frequently question established knowledge and customary convictions, encouraging readers to confront the underlying ambiguities of existence. As an author who reflects his human belongings, he "objects to philosophers who limit the world and life to the intellectual, the rational, and the analytic, ignoring reason's subordination to the needs of the heart and will" (Candelaria, 2012, p. 23). Unamuno's notable characteristic as a writer and thinker is his unwavering dedication to uncovering truth and maintaining authenticity. He avoided oversimplified explanations and welcomed the intricacies of human experience, frequently involving himself in self-analysis and introspection in his writings. Unamuno's literary works exemplify his profound conviction regarding the significance of individual autonomy, decision-making, and personal accountability in determining one's fate. His legacy persists not just through his literary and philosophical works but also through his steadfast dedication to intellectual integrity and the tireless quest for truth in a world filled with uncertainty.

About Cartesian thinking

René Descartes, a prominent philosopher who obtained a place for himself in the history of mankind with his questioning of “being,” aimed to ascribe meaning to the presence of animals as well as humans. Even though he articulates such terms as mind and body for humans, his assertion with the terms he uses for animals such as ‘automata’ and ‘machine’ brought up the idea that animals are devoid of cognitive faculties and sensory perceptions, which sparked much dispute. The dispute derives from the fact that Descartes regards animal actions as reactions, which are the results of stimuli. This means that animals lack consciousness or mind, which blurs the mind-body dualism between humans and animals. While humans have mind and self-control, animals are automata, which only have bodies that lack thinking and feeling (Descartes, 2006), making them machines. However, he explains the difference between machines and animals as machines as follows: he argues that if machines had the organs and shape of monkeys or other irrational animals, we would not know they were not real humans. If machines resembled us in body and imitated our actions, we would recognise they were not real humans. They would not be able to use words or signs to declare our thoughts, as we do. Additionally, they would inevitably fail to perform some tasks because their organs were disposed of in a specific way. Reason is a universal instrument, but machines have a specific disposition for each action, making it impossible for machines to act in all life's occurrences in the same way as humans (Descartes, 2006, p. 47). Descartes believed that machines and animals may display certain human-like behaviours, but they ultimately lack the logic and consciousness that are essential aspects of human existence.

The absence of feeling has been interpreted as a lack of pain; it has been the justified reason for mistreatment of animals both in scientific experiments and in daily life (Sagan and Druyan, 1992, p. 371). Given that this rejection has been intended to ethically manage, harness, and employ animals without remorse, it is essential to establish a distinct delineation between humans and animals. Those with the urge to exploit animals took advantage of the grey areas left unintentionally by Descartes himself.

The Port Royal followers of Descartes, a group of philosophers and scientists, “are said to have tortured animals with the confident conviction that their cries of agony were comparable to the noises from machinery” (Griffin 1992, p. 248). However, they were opposed by other philosophers with the explanation that even though animals don't have reflective consciousness to express their pain, they have perceptual consciousness about their own bodies, which urges Griffin to conclude in his ground-breaking work *Animal Minds* that they also may have self-awareness (p. 249). However, in another credited essay, *A Brute to the Brutes*, Cottingham (1978) suggests that Descartes' view may have been influenced by fuzziness in his thinking about consciousness and self-consciousness. He also highlights the difficulty that Descartes faced in reconciling his dualistic metaphysics with the undeniable experience of animal sensations, and he concludes that Descartes may not have been consistent in his views, but he did not completely deny animals' feelings. In his discussion, he gives the dictionary definition of automaton (machine that is relatively self-operating) to refute the claim that animals cannot feel, which he calls ‘the monstrous thesis’ (Cottingham, 1978, p. 553). Descartes' use of the word is meant to explain the difference between man and animal: “Animals do not think (*penser* or *cogitare*); they are not endowed with a mind (*mens, esprit*); they lack reason (*raison*); they do not have a rational soul (*âme raisonnable*)” (p. 554). However, for animals, in one of his letters, Descartes uses such expressions as “‘impulses of anger, fear, hunger’; ‘expression of one of its feelings’; ‘expressions of fear, hope, and joy’” (p. 557). It enables Cottingham to reveal how the monstrous thesis contradicts Descartes' own opinions.

The 20th century has witnessed many philosophers who struggled to liberate animals from such utilitarian approaches. The vegetarian idea proposed by Carol Adams (1990) and the animal liberation philosophy advocated by Peter Singer (1975) are considered the most influential in raising awareness for the beings of animals. Peter Singer states that although biologists try to prove it, a common sense has now been formed about animals feeling pain (Singer, p. 17). But how long has this sense been started to form? This study aims to evaluate how animals in literature are perceived in two different cultures before the aforementioned common sense is fully formed by focusing on two novels written at the beginning of the twentieth century and by referring to Descartes' perception of animals and its interpretations. Unamuno has previously been compared to Sebahattin Ali in Turkish literature within the framework of existential themes (Kayacık, 2016), but this comparison was not cultural but theme-oriented. It is thought that the consideration of these two novels written by two innovative authors in almost the same years will help to reveal the differences between two cultures and to show how perception is acquired.

A brief summary of *Şık*

Şık, Gürpınar's first appearance in the literary world, was published as a serial novel on *Tercuman-ı Hakikat* Journal on 23 February 1888 and completed on 2 July 1888. The novel, like Ahmet Mithat Efendi's *Felâtnun Bey* and *Râkım Efendi*, to which it is compared by literary authorities, is a valuable work depicting the wrong Westernisation of Turkish society in the 19th century (Üner, 2008, p. 254). The story is about Şâtırzâde Şöhret Bey, a twenty-five-year-old man, who is fond of luxury, fashion, ostentation, and 'alla franca' despite his small salary. After spending a few days with Madame Potiş, a notorious prostitute who is over thirty-five, who has been kicked out of the most vulgar brothels, Şöhret Bey seeks ways to meet her again, and the story begins when he steals his mother's diamond earrings and sells them. Şöhret Bey, who is fond of the gentility, tells Madame Potiş that it would be fashionable to have a 'breed' dog with them. Unable to find a dog from anyone after long endeavours, Madame dresses up a stunted street dog and introduces it as an endemic species of the Balearic Islands. As Şöhret Bey walks along with Madame Potiş in a ridiculous imitation of Parisian fashion, and Drol, the dog that cannot hide its breed-specific behaviour despite its red silk cap, is attacked by the neighbourhood dogs. After escaping from the brawl by jumping into an empty carriage passing by, this strange trio enters Baba Perdriks' restaurant to rest and eat. Realising that their owners are getting closer to each other under the influence of alcohol, the dog takes advantage of this opportunity and ransacks the kitchen. Drol is discovered upon the complaint of the customers, and after being severely beaten, Şöhret Bey loses ten liras, his entire fortune, to Baba Perdriks to compensate for the damage the dog caused. When he goes to his mistress's house, dressed in rags and penniless, he does not find her; moreover, he is punished by the landlady by being poured coal dust. Not knowing what to do, he is invited to by his old friend Maşuk Bey to home. He spends the evening with Râzi Efendi, Selami Efendi, Râik Bey, who is almost like Şöhret Bey in every manner, and Maşuk Bey's lover Mademoiselle Adel. However, the night ends with being thrown out of the house because Drol's endless barking disturbs the guests.

The following evening, Şöhret Bey gets together with Madame Potiş at an entertainment venue, but his fun is interrupted again because of Drol. When Drol misses the food on the grill and is killed in the commotion, the police arrive at the scene. Şöhret Bey, who thinks that the police are looking for the dog's owner because of what he has stolen, confesses all his crimes. After the prosecution and judgement, he is sentenced to prison. In the epilogue, the author expresses that it is a favour to put Şöhret Bey in prison while his equals face worse results in real life. He prays for the younger generation in the hope that no one can face such endings due to false imitation of Western societies.

A brief summary of Niebla (Mist)

The narrative centres around Augusto Pérez, an affluent and purposeless young man who floats through existence without any clear objective. While walking through the streets one day, he meets a captivating woman named Eugenia, who quickly becomes the focus of him. Notwithstanding his first social discomfort, Augusto chooses to actively follow her, resulting in a sequence of meetings and contemplations of love, existence, and identity.

Augusto's endeavour to win over Eugenia is hindered by her financial hardships and her involvement with another man, Mauricio. Augusto employs a private investigator to track Eugenia's whereabouts and communicates his emotions through written correspondence in his endeavour to win her love. Nevertheless, Eugenia declines his romantic gestures, causing Augusto to experience profound existential anguish. Meanwhile, Augusto becomes entangled with another girl, Rosario, and he starts to doubt his true feelings for Eugenia.

During this period of inner upheaval, Augusto engages in philosophical discussions with both his friends and his dog, Orfeo. These discussions explore concepts of autonomy, the essence of being, and the quest for significance. Augusto decides to propose Eugenia, and surprisingly she accepts the proposal, and they get engaged. However, just a few days before the marriage, Eugenia sends a letter explaining that she was in love with Maurico and she is leaving with him. Augusto, heartbroken, thinks of taking his own life. Unamuno obfuscates the distinction between fiction and reality by including himself as a character within the story. Augusto has a metafictional occurrence when he visits Unamuno with the intention of receiving guidance, but instead learns that he exists solely as a fictional character within a literary work.

The story comes to conclusion when Augusto, confronted with the realisation of his own fictitious existence, chooses to take his own life. Nevertheless, Unamuno, in his role as the author, refuses to let Augusto the freedom to make this decision, thus establishing his dominance over Augusto's destiny. The novella has an enigmatic ending, given by the dog Orfeo, prompting readers to contemplate the essence of being and the relationship between a dog and a man. What is left there at the end of the novella are the dead bodies of Augusto and Orfeo.

Discussion

As can be understood from the information given so far, both stories involve young single men who cross paths with a woman and a dog and change directions. However, it should be stated that both works have unique characteristics due to both authors' own styles and their writing purposes. In this section, these two works will be examined comparatively in terms of the authors' styles, the contexts in which the books were written, the cultural values and norms to which the authors adhered, and what these reflect on the perception of animals. Before starting the detailed analysis, it is useful to state that the novel as a genre reached Turkish literature much later than Spanish literature. Therefore, there are serious differences between these two traditions in terms of literature in the period in which the works were written. While the first examples after the Tanzimat in Turkish literature were penned with the purpose of teaching society, in Spanish literature, authors wrote works that were more focused on their own inner worlds. However, there is another similar issue. Both countries are going through politically and militarily exhausted years after their glorious pasts, and this exhaustion and crisis are spreading to the public. While the Spanish turned to more serious philosophical and psychological experiments, Turkish

literature turned its face to daily life under the influence of realism and naturalism. Gürpınar and Unamuno were also exposed to this atmosphere that influenced the literary circles they were in and produced works that were pioneers in their own literature.

The influence of realism and naturalism on Gürpınar is undeniable. In fact, the “street” entered Turkish literature with its lively and realistic yet psychologically deep characters (Tanpınar, 1995, p. 67). It is clear how local and everyday language he used, the characters he created, and the dialogues he established were. It can be claimed that he wrote his novels with the aim of educating his readers and encouraging them to think with his realistic style. Three concepts associated with Gürpınar are social justice, the relationship between men and women, and religion (Moran, 2008, p. 66). On the other hand, Unamuno, influenced by Kierkegaard, introduces his characters' struggle to become individuals with existentialist thoughts and philosophical and psychological depth. Doubt, death, and immortality are three words associated with Unamuno (Panico, 1963, p. 471). While the group of writers of The Generation of '98, of which he was a part, looked to the future with a romantic attitude after the historical crisis, it can be said that Unamuno continued the pessimistic approach of the realist-positivist tradition (Kayacık, 2016, p. 23). The main difference between Gürpınar and Unamuno is that Gürpınar depicts his characters in a detailed way but does not let the reader reach the character's psychology or background, while Unamuno provides details about the psychology of the character but avoids long depictions.

Şık examines the cultural and social structure of the last period of the Ottoman Empire in the context of distorted westernisation and artificial modernization. Gürpınar criticises the artificial survival of Western traditions in the Ottoman Empire. *Mist*, on the other hand, was written in line with the intellectual and philosophical tendencies of the early periods of 20th century Spain, that is, in the period when existential questions, political turmoil, and loss of national identity were on the agenda. *Şık* criticises the imitation of the West by focusing on social satire and criticism themes. He tells the story of the failure to fully internalise the West and modernisation by putting the novel's protagonist in comical situations. He reveals how modernism, as a concept, cannot be grounded in every layer of society. *Mist* portrays the protagonist Augusto Perez's loss between the concepts of identity, existence, and reality. Augusto's recognition that he exists as a character within a story authored by Unamuno himself provides a metafictional aspect, challenging the distinctions between fiction and reality. Unamuno used metafiction as a literary technique to deliberately obscure the boundaries between the author, the characters, and the reader. This approach functions as a philosophical investigation into the essence of creation, the function of the author, and the existential predicament of individuals, such as Augusto, who find themselves torn between destiny and personal choice. In sum, Şöhret Bey, exists and is defined by his appearance, and we cannot gain insight into his inner world, while Augusto Perez has an introspective character with complexities and questioning.

The first detail to be examined is the naming of the dogs. In *Şık*, the name of the dog, a street dog dressed up to look suitable for society, is Drol. Drol (drôle) means “funny, strange, incredible, terrific” in French (Collins Online Dictionary) and this meaning symbolises the character of the protagonist, Şöhret (Göçgün, 1993). Because the novel is based on both Şöhret Bey and Drol getting themselves into funny and difficult situations with their European appearances, however, this dog is not addressed only by its name in the novel. While the dog is referred to by the characters throughout the text with adjectives such as terrific monster, vulgar animal, and poor animal, the author of the book named Chapter 4 *The Monster*, and Chapter 5 *Attack on the Monster*. Although this naming and characterisation of the dog is carried out consciously to create a contrasting reading of the text (Gür, 2021, p. 749), it also gives a clue

about how society and the author perceive dogs.

In Unamuno's work, the puppy Orfeo is found on the street as he is about to die. Orfeo takes his name from the Greek mythological character Orpheus. Unamuno considers the notion of naming something or someone to be highly intricate and significant, in line with his characteristic style (Collins, 2002). Throughout the myth, Orpheus tries to get together with his lover, Eurydice. In *Mist*, Augusto wants to be with Eugenia. What is more is that "Augusto subconsciously follows the pattern of the romantic Orpheus and Eurydice myth. He is the one naming others based on the Orpheus story. Ironically, this makes him both the author and the fictional character playing out a role in his own story, a clever parallel of Unamuno's later intrusion on the novel as a character" (Delbar, 2019, p. 36). From the moment Orfeo is found on the street, he gives us the feeling that he will have an important place in the work, even with his name. Orfeo seems to have the traits of goodness, innocence, and virtue that represent the brotherly love between men, a feeling that has been weakened by reason (Decarlo, 1969). With these characteristics, Orfeo is the only positive and human character in the novel (Kirsner, 1953). Therefore, Orfeo offers clues in the text about the positive perception of dogs in Western society and their acceptance in social life.

The most fundamental difference is related to the acceptance of dogs as beings. For Gürpınar, a dog is a creature that cannot abandon its nature, even if it is dressed and treated differently. Animals do not act with their consciousness but with their instincts. He expresses this many times in the novel: "But where does a hungry dog run away to? Wherever it smells food, it goes." These words turn the dog into a mere "automata." After causing chaos in the restaurant, Drol is saved by Şöhret Bey when he is almost killed by a big guy wearing a chef's hat with a stick. (29) However, after the sticks he receives, the dog is shaking all over (p. 31). Şöhret tries very hard to save him. Because, according to Şöhret Bey, this dog is a special species that cannot be found anywhere else but the Balearic Islands. The value he gives is not in the animal itself, but in the value, it attributes to itself, because when defending his dog after the chaos, he says the following: "Know well that the dog standing before you is the noblest of all dogs on earth. Although he may seem like a weak dog to superficial observers like you, he is as valuable as gold tarnished and transformed into a dog" (p. 33). What is important for Mr. Şöhret is his own image. On the other hand, Unamuno gives Orfeo consciousness and the ability to understand, allowing him to be the listening party of the monologues in the existential questions in the text (Parker, 1967). Augusto considers Orfeo's canine nature to be of minimal significance in terms of ontological consciousness. (Collins, 2002). Augusto believes in the soul-body distinction, he tells Orfeo: "my body is too much for me, Orfeo, my body is too much because I lack a soul. Or perhaps I lack a soul because I have too much body. I can touch my body, Orfeo, I can feel it. I can see it, but my soul? Where is my soul? Do I have one?" (Unamuno, 2014, p. 191). He behaves Orfeo, although in the body of a dog, as if he acts with his consciousness. The approach of Augusto is not in parallel with Descartes's assertion that animals are just automata that can only react to stimuli.

Mentioned above are the personal treatments of the authors. Yet, the works also enable us to gain insight for societies' perceptions. The reason why a black street dog can find a place as a character in the novel *Şık* is that a 'breed' dog could not be found because of European affectation. Because according to common belief, "it is considered a great shame in Europe for a man and woman who go out on the street with all their ornaments perfect not to have an elegant dog with them" (Gürpınar, 2002, p. 8). The real reason for these events that dragged Drol to his death is that he is perceived by society as no different from an artificial object. Therefore, Drol is always excluded, bullied, and subjected to violence by others throughout the story. For example, when Drol encounters street dogs and causes chaos, he is exposed to

cane blows from Madam Potiş and even “the poor animal crosses the neighbourhood border, preferring the possible attacks of his fellows in the future to the violent cane blows he is currently receiving” (Gürpınar, 2002, p. 14). While street dogs attack Drol, who is dressed in clothes, from different directions, the audience watching this chaos laughs with laughter and some try to drive the dogs away by throwing stones. Gürpınar says that in the midst of all this violence, Drol seeks refuge in Madam Potiş in pain. Drol is not the only one who is subjected to violence against dogs. Similarly, when Şöhret Bey enters the restaurant with Drol, Madam Potiş keeps Drol away from the food with a cane, while the waiters constantly drive away the dogs that have gathered outside with their sticks. However, this is mentioned as something ordinary, something normal that cannot be objected to in everyday life. In short, in *Şık*, it is occasionally mentioned that the dog/dogs are suffering, but these are expressed through their reactions to the effect. It can be said that it is accepted as a kind of automata.

When evaluated in the sense of Cartesian thinking, the interaction and communication style between the owners and their dogs are the most distinctive features of the two works. Since Drol is like the differentiated reflection of Şöhret Bey in the mirror, Şöhret does not communicate with his copy or try to understand him. The two are already as if they are acquaintances. However, there is a deeper connection between Augusto and Orfeo. It is Orfeo who listens to Augusto's monologues in his existential and love-related questionings. Augusto wants to understand Orfeo as well. In order to see behind his meaningful gaze, he asks questions like “but tell me, Orfeo, will it ever occur to dogs to think they are men, just as there have been men who thought they were dogs?” (Unamuno, 2014, p. 121). Sometimes he believes that Orfeo will experience similar feelings to his own: “Wait till you see her, Orfeo, wait till you get to know her! Then, you will experience the anguish of being nothing but a dog, as I feel the anguish of being nothing more than a man!” (Unamuno, 2014, p. 135). Unamuno, as an omniscient narrator, shares similar feelings with Augusto on this issue: “As Orfeo had never seen a loom, it is unlikely that he understood his master. But looking into his eyes as he spoke, he sensed his meaning” (Unamuno, 2014, p. 123). Doubts that Orfeo can understand Augusto are eliminated. After a while, Augusto, who is already shaken by his mother's death, becomes attached to Orfeo. He worries about him: “Be careful with bones, Orfeo, very careful. I don't want you to choke on one. I don't want to see you die before my very eyes begging for life” (Unamuno, 2014, p. 191). In short, Orfeo has become a companion for Augusto.

In fact, parallel to what Haraway (2003) said, the role animals play in the existence of humans is explained as follows: Men are men only because there are dogs and cats and horses and oxen and sheep and other animals of all kinds, especially domestic ones. In the absence of domestic animals on which to unload the weight of life's animality, would man have achieved his humanity? (Unamuno, 2014, p. 333). Inasmuch as, in this case, animals gain “self” together with humans. However, within the framework of Cartesian philosophy, it is not possible for animals to gain a self. They are not regarded as having the necessary installation to be behaved or perceived as humans are approached, even though many scholars disagree with it. In a most recent essay, discussing the animal standpoint, it is even taken further by claiming “animals, like women, workers and indigenous people, are too diverse in their experiences to generate a single framework” (Horsthemke, 2024, p. 114). It means Unamuno seems to have managed to go beyond the world of thought in which he was raised.

Unamuno sometimes seems to contradict himself and continues his criticisms. For example, when Eugenia wants Orfeo to leave the house, Augusto turns to Orfeo and delivers the monologue:

Come here. Poor thing! How few days have you left now to live with me! She doesn't want you in the house. And where can I send you? What am I going to do with you? What will happen to you without

me? You could die, I know! Only a dog is capable of dying if it has no master. And I have been your master, your father, your god. (Unamuno, 2014, p. 331)

It is quite understandable that Unamuno summarises not the thought of himself but others. As he continues, "I can see you are suffering because you lack words" (Unamuno, 2014, p. 333). Unamuno's ability to understand that animals suffer even though they are unvoiced can be interpreted as a serious criticism of Cartesianist thinkers who likened the sounds animals make as a result of suffering to the sounds of machines.

The fact that both dogs lose their lives at the end of the stories is also worth examining. After the troubles he caused, Drol was dressed in a large blue blanket instead of his red hood so that he would not be recognised by Madam Potiş. However, just as Şöhret Bey could not change his essence with his clothing, Drol cannot escape the guidance of his instincts:

In this novel of 'elegants', mighty Drol, who almost took the place of an important person, that is, who was no less strange than them in terms of his behaviour and mannerisms, did not hesitate to escape from there when he felt the indifference shown by his drunk masters towards him and that his cord had been left free. But where does the hungry dog escape and go? Where does it go when it smells food? (Gürpınar, 2022, p. 80)

Drol, who could not break away from his nature, this time receives a very hard blow from one of the cooks when he steals food. He attacks the surroundings in pain. In this section, while it is the case that Drol follows his instincts, no insight into his inner world is given to the reader. It is not mentioned that he feels anything other than physical pain when people brutally hit him. As a result, he is thought to be mad and is shot by a Frank with a revolver. It is painful to be shot by a Frank while trying to adapt to Frankish culture.

When Drol dies, Şöhret Bey embraces the bloodied corpse and cries, but the reason for this is not his sadness for the dog but that he accidentally told the police about his crimes. There is hypocrisy here. Drol, who was used and exploited when he was alive and was ignored despite the pain he suffered, is also used as a tool in his death. In the chaos that ensued, Drol's death was not perceived as something to be sad about by anyone. Only Şöhret Bey is saddened by Drol's supposed material value.

When Augusto is killed by Unamuno, Orfeo approaches his master's motionless body, and Orfeo is made to speak at the end of the story. Because in the monologues that have continued up until now, Orfeo has listened while Augusto spoke, whereas the protagonist is deprived of the ability to communicate and is reminded of his biological limitations by death, the death of his master grants Orfeo the ability to speak, which raises him above ordinary animal life and allows him to articulate intricate thoughts and ideas (Collins, 2002). Looking at what the dog says about speech and other topics shows that Orfeo has a very moral view of life. It finds humans to be very confusing in this way and is worried about how easy it is for language to be used for lying and ambiguity (Collins, 2002). Dogs are actually seen as nothing more than tools. Unamuno created a kind of alienation in the epilogue when he made Orfeo talk and told his thoughts about people. Augusto cared about Orfeo's feelings throughout the novel and questioned whether he could feel them or not. Orfeo, on the other hand, questioned human nature with the pain of his deceased owner because Augusto was dragged to death not for a physical reason but for psychological reasons. In this case, the disorder in human nature that dragged him to death must be found. "What an odd animal man is! He is never where he ought to be, that is, dealing with what he has in hand, and he speaks to lie, and he wears clothes!" (Unamuno, 2014, p. 397). It is interesting for Orfeo that man is not satisfied with what he is given, always wants more, and lies for this reason because it is not possible for

animals to lie. Animals are straight; when they are happy, they show it, when they are hungry, they show it. The strange problem with man that Orfeo could not attribute meaning to is the use of language: "Language has made him hypocritical. And hypocrisy should be called anthropism if shamelessness is called cynicism. And he wants to make hypocrites of us, of dogs in other words, makes us actors, performers! We dogs, who willingly joined with him (...)" (Unamuno, 2014, p. 395).

From Orfeo's point of view, man is thrown away because he lost all his manners when he stood up on two legs, and for this reason he wears clothes. However, this is not the only strange thing:

What a strange animal man is! He is never engaged with what he is actually doing. He strokes us without our knowing why and not when we caress him most, and the more we give ourselves to him, the more he rejects us or punishes us. There is no way of knowing what he wants, that is, if even he knows it himself. He never seems to be fully engaged in what he is doing, nor does he look at what he is looking at. It is as if there were another world for him. And naturally, if there is another world, there isn't this one. (Unamuno, 2014, p. 393)

Augusto wanted to have Eugenia despite having a certain amount of wealth, a certain social status, and intellectual knowledge. Augusto was betrayed and lost his life at the end of this process. It is quite not surprising for Orfeo, who witnessed all the process, to think that man does not know what he wants and does not look at what he is doing, creating a sense of another world, which prevents him from engaging with what he has in this world. Just as Augusto is certain that Orfeo understands him, Orfeo is certain that he understands people. But on one condition: violence. Orfeo expresses this as follows: "We only really understand him when he too howls. When a man howls or shouts or threatens, we other animals understand him perfectly well." (Unamuno, 2014, p. 395). It is surprising that he claims that they can only understand the violence they are accustomed to – the same violence that caused Drol's death. Orfeo approaches with pity the fact that humans and animals were once naked and defenceless together in nature, and that humans are today separated from their own nature: "They store their dead! An animal who speaks, who wears clothes, and who stores his dead! Poor humans!" (Unamuno, 2014, p. 397). Because in nature, one does not speak, one does not wear clothes, and the dead are left to rot outside. The separation of humans from their nature and their alienation from animals is magnificently conveyed through Orfeo by Unamuno who is deeply engaged with existential philosophy.

Conclusion

It is not surprising that the dog was chosen to represent a ridiculous and pitiful character in Turkish culture in the years when dogs had not yet gained a different identity apart from their functions such as protection and hunting that would benefit people. The prevailing opinion was that it would not be possible for an ordinary street dog to gain a different identity and that it would follow its own instincts and nature. The dog existed only as a body. The duality that Descartes mentioned had not yet been acquired by society. Although the dog was accepted only as a body, the fact that this body could suffer was ignored. Due to its instincts, the dog was humiliated, despised, subjected to violence, and killed horribly throughout the story in *Şık*. In short, the dog served as a tool again. The dog was used as a tool in this method in order to be read as a parallel to the protagonist, Şöhret Bey regarding the possible results of artificial westernization. It could not exist as a representation of an emotional world. However, it should be noted that the fact that the novel was not a psychological novel and that a tragicomic story was told with the aim of teaching a lesson by selecting characters from everyday life may not have provided sufficient character depth.

In *Mist*, on the other hand, where the mental state of a lonely character with philosophical concerns is

narrated through the character falling in love, no educational concern is observed. In this work, Unamuno gave Orfeo to Augusto, who was lost while questioning his existence in his inner journey, as a consolation. Although Orfeo initially existed only as a body, in the epilogue given at the end of the novel, he revealed that he also had feelings upon the death of his owner. Although the physical pain he felt is not mentioned throughout the novel, it is clear that he died because of the pain he felt for the death of his owner. Orfeo interprets his view of humans and the absurdity of human life from his own perspective. Orfeo has stripped himself of his own instincts, instead, he thought and commented. According to Descartes' conceptual understanding, he has gained his own existence. Orfeo is a companion. He accompanied his owner in his struggle for life as well as when he died. His existence is not human-like; on the contrary, it has an original structure.

There are two points to be noted in the comparison of these two works. The first is that Miguel de Unamuno is well-versed in Western philosophical thought, understands the Renaissance and later thinkers, and is a part of the narrative tradition that also focuses on the inner world of the character, which has continued since Cervantes. Hüseyin Rahmi Gürpınar, on the other hand, is inclined to use the novel style, which has recently been adopted in a society that has recently distanced itself from Eastern culture and turned its face to Western culture, in a didactic way. The second is the concerns that the writers have while writing their works. Drol and Orfeo were not created with similar concerns. The roles they assume in the story are different. In this sense, even though Drol provides the image at the center of the plot, it is the object of Gürpınar's main message. Orfeo in Unamuno's novel, on the other hand, is a character just like others; it is the subject. Since the works are mirrors of the society they were written in, they have provided certain clues in line with the purposes of this study. Therefore, comparing characters created for the same purpose in the future may provide more definitive results.

References

- Adams, C. J. (1990). *The sexual politics of meat: A feminist-vegetarian critical theory*. Continuum.
- Candelaria, M. (2012). *The revolt of unreason: Miguel de Unamuno and Antonio Caso on the crisis of modernity*. Rodopi.
- Caraway, J. E. (1995). The wish to believe: The problem of faith and reason in the philosophy of Miguel de Unamuno. *Mediterranean Studies*, 5, 151–162. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41166838>
- Collins Dictionary. (2024, August 15). *Drôle*. Collins French-English Dictionary. <https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/french-english/dr%C3%B4le>
- Collins, M. S. (2002). Orfeo and the Cratyline conspiracy in Unamuno's *Niebla*. *Bulletin of Spanish Studies*, 79(2–3), 285–306. <https://doi.org/10.1080/147538202317345032>
- Cottingham, J. (1978). "A brute to the brutes?": Descartes' treatment of animals. *Philosophy*, 53(206), 551–559. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3749880>
- DeCarlo, A. (1969). *The image of man as portrayed in the novels of Miguel de Unamuno* (Order No. 7004909). ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (302392665). <https://www.proquest.com/dissertations-theses/image-man-as-protrayed-novels-miguel-de-unamuno/docview/302392665/se-2>
- Delbar, D. C. (2019). *Myths on the move: A critical pluralist approach to the study of classical mythology in post-classical works* (Master's thesis). Brigham Young University. <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd/7492>
- Descartes, R. (2006). *A discourse on the method of correctly conducting one's reason and seeking truth in the sciences* (I. Maclean, Trans.). Oxford University Press.
- Göçgün, Ö. (1993). Hüseyin Rahmi Gürpınar'ın romanları ve romanlarında şahıs kadrosu. Kültür Bakanlığı.
- Griffin, D. R. (1992). *Animal minds*. University of Chicago Press.
- Gür, M. (2021). Şık romanında alafrangalık sembolizmi ve canavarlık. *Motif Akademi Halkbilimi Dergisi*, 14(34), 742–763. <https://doi.org/10.12981/mahder.858429>
- Gürpınar, H. R. (2022). *Şık*. Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.
- Haraway, D. (2003). *The companion species manifesto: Dogs, people, and significant otherness*. Prickly Paradigm Press.
- Horsthemke, K. (2024). Critical Animal Historiography, Experiential Subjectivity and Animal Standpoint Theory. In: Glover, M.J., Mitchell, L. (eds) *Animals as Experiencing Entities*. The Palgrave Macmillan Animal Ethics Series. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-46456-0_4
- Kayaçık, Z. (2016). *Miguel de Unamuno'nun Sis'i ile Sabahattin Ali'nin Kürk Mantolu Madonna adlı yapıtlarında varoluşsal bir biçim olarak aşk kavramı* (Master's thesis). Ankara University, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Kirsner, R. (1953). The novel of Unamuno: A study in creative determinism. *Modern Language Journal*, 37(2), 129.
- Moran, B. (2008). *Türk romanına eleştirel bir bakış-1*. İletişim Yayınları.
- Özbalcı, M. (1991). Hüseyin Rahmi Gürpınar'ın bazı romanlarında ferdi ve sosyal tenkit. *Ondokuz Mayıs University Journal of Education Faculty*, 6(1), 213–226.
- Panico, M. J. (1963). Unamuno: doubt or denial? *Hispania*, 46(3), 471–475. <https://doi.org/10.2307/336846>
- Parker, A. A. (1967). On the interpretation of *Niebla*. In J. R. Barcia & M. A. Zeitlin (Eds.), *Unamuno: Creator and creation* (pp. 116–138). University of California Press.
- Sagan, C., & Druyan, A. (1992). *Shadows of forgotten ancestors: A search for who we are*. Ballantine

Books.

- Singer, P. (1975). *Animal liberation: A new ethics for our treatment of animals*. HarperCollins.
- Tanpınar, A. H. (1977). *Edebiyat üzerine makaleler* (Z. Kerman, Ed.). Dergâh Yayınları.
- Tanpınar, A. H. (1995). *Edebiyat üzerine makaleler*. Dergâh Yayınları.
- Unamuno, M. de. (1926). *Tragic sense of life* (J. E. Crawford Fitch, Trans.). Dover Publications.
- Unamuno, M. de. (2006). *Sis*. (Yıldız Ersoy Canpolat, Trans.). Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.
- Unamuno, M. de. (2014). *Unamuno: Mist* (John Macklin, Trans.). Liverpool University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv16zjz7r>